1 2 3	Thomas C. Sand, OSB No. 773322 tom.sand@millernash.com Joseph Vance, P.C., OSB No. 991320 joseph.vance@millernash.com Katherine Bennett, OSB No. 221482 katie.bennett@millernash.com			
4	Phone: 503.224.5858 Fax: 503.224.0155			
5	Attorneys for Defendants			
6				
7				
8				
9	UNITED STATI	ES DISTRICT COURT		
11	DISTRICT OF OREGON			
12	PORTLAND DIVISION			
13	REX STEVENS, an individual,	Case No. 3:22-CV-00952-SI		
14	Plaintiff,			
15	v.	FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT		
1617	URBAN FT, INC., a Delaware corporation, and iPARSE, LLC, an Oregon limited liability company,			
18	Defendants.			
19	UFT (NORTH AMERICA), LLC, a Delaware limited liability company,			
20	Fourth-Party Plaintiff,			
21	v.			
22	REX STEVENS, an individual,			
23	Fourth-Party Defendant.			
24				
25				
26				

Page 1 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

1	REX STEVENS, an individual,		
2	Fifth-Party Plaintiff,		
3	v.		
4	URBAN FT GROUP, INC., a Delaware corporation; FINTECH IMAGING		
5	SOLUTIONS, INC., a Delaware corporation; URBAN FT CLIENT		
6	SOLUTIONS, LLC, a Delaware limited		
7	liability company; UFT PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, LLC, a Delaware limited		
8	liability company; RICHARD STEGGALL, an individual,		
9	Fifth-Party Defendants.		
10			
11	Fifth-party defendants Urban l	FT Group, Inc., FinTech Imaging Solutions, Inc.,	
12	Urban FT Client Solutions, LLC, UFT Professional Services, LLC, and Richard Steggall ("Fifth		
13	party defendants) answer fifth-party plaintiff Rex Stevens' fifth-party complaint as follows:		
14	47.		
15	The allegations contained in Paragraph 1-38 are not directed these fifth-party defendants.		
16	Rather they are directed at fourth-party plaintiff, UFT (North America) LLC. Therefore the		
17	allegations contained in Paragraph 1-38 do not require an admission, denial, or other responding		
18	directly from these defendants. Insofar as any allegation contained in Paragraphs 1-38 is		
19	construed as against these defendants, these defendants deny each and every allegation, or assert		
20	that they lack the knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of		
21	the allegations contained in each paragraph and the allegations are therefore denied.		
22	48.		
23	Fifth-party defendants admit that Urba	an FT Group, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its	
24	principal place of business in California. The	fifth-party defendants deny the remaining	
25	allegations contained in Paragraph 48.		
26	111		

Page 2 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

1	49.
2	Fifth-party defendants admit that FinTech Imaging Solutions, Inc. was a Delaware
3	corporation with its principal place of business in New York. The fifth-party defendants deny the
4	remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 49.
5	50.
6	Fifth-party defendants admit that Urban FT Client Solutions, LLC is a Delaware limited
7	liability company with its sole member, Urban FT Group, Inc., being incorporated in Delaware
8	with its principal place of business in California. The fifth-party defendants deny the remaining
9	allegations contained in Paragraph 50.
10	51.
11	Fifth-party defendants admit that UFT Professional Services, LLC is a Delaware limited
12	liability company with its sole member, Urban FT Group, Inc., being incorporated in Delaware
13	with its principal place of business in California. The fifth-party defendants deny the remaining
14	allegations contained in Paragraph 51.
15	52.
16	Fifth-party defendants admit only that Richard Steggall is an individual residing in
17	Westchester County, New York, is the Chairman of Urban FT Group, Inc., was the Chief
18	Executive Officer of Urban FT, Inc. from 2015 through to 2018, was the Manager of UFT (North
19	America), LLC from 2017 through to 2021, was the Manager of iParse, LLC from 2017 through
20	to 2018, was the Manager of Urban FT Client Solutions, LLC from 2020 through to 2021, and
21	UFT Professional Services, LLC from 2020 through to 2021. Fifth-party defendants deny the
22	remaining allegations of Paragraph 52 as stated.
23	53.
24	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 53 as stated.
25	
26	

1	54.
2	Fifth-party defendants admit only that urbanft.com is the website affiliated with Urban
3	FT Group, Inc., Urban FT Client Solutions, LLC, and UFT Professional Services, LLC. FinTech
4	Imaging Solutions Inc., UFT (North America) LLC, Urban FT, Inc., and iParse, LLC are non-
5	active entities which are not associated with the urbanft.com website. Fifth-party defendants
6	deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 54.
7	55.
8	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 55.
9	56.
10	Fifth-party defendants admit only that Urban FT. Group, Inc., operates out of the office
11	located at 400 Spectrum Center Dr., Suite 1900, Irvine, CA 92618. Urban FT Client Solutions,
12	LLC and UFT Professional Services each operate out of the office located at 110 Cheshire Lane,
13	Suite 375, Minnetonka, MN 55305. FinTech Imaging Solutions Inc., UFT (North America) LLC
14	Urban FT, Inc., and iParse, LLC are non-active entities and therefore do not operate out of any
15	office space. Fifth-party defendants deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 56.
16	57.
17	Fifth-party defendants deny that Urban FT. Group, Inc. and UFT Professional Services
18	share the same employees. UFT Professional Services do, from time to time, perform services
19	for other entities on a time and materials basis, and which is invoiced to, and paid by, the entity
20	receiving such services. Urban FT Client Solutions does not employ any staff. FinTech Imaging
21	Solutions Inc., UFT (North America) LLC, Urban FT, Inc., and iParse, LLC are non-active
22	entities and therefore do not employ any individual or personnel. Fifth-party defendants deny the
23	remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 57.
24	58.
25	Fifth-party defendants deny that Urban FT. Group, Inc. and UFT Professional Services
26	share the same employees. UFT Professional Services do, from time to time, perform services

1	for other entities on a time and materials basis, and which is invoiced to, and paid by, the entity
2	receiving such services. Urban FT Client Solutions does not employ any staff. FinTech Imaging
3	Solutions Inc., UFT (North America) LLC, Urban FT, Inc., and iParse, LLC are non-active
4	entities and therefore do not employ any individual or personnel. Fifth-party defendants deny the
5	remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 58.
6	59.
7	Fifth-party defendants deny that Urban FT. Group, Inc. and UFT Professional Services
8	share the same employees. UFT Professional Services do, from time to time, perform services
9	for other entities on a time and materials basis, and which is invoiced to, and paid by, the entity
10	receiving such services. Urban FT Client Solutions does not employ any staff. FinTech Imaging
11	Solutions Inc., UFT (North America) LLC, Urban FT, Inc., and iParse, LLC are non-active
12	entities and therefore do not employ any individual or personnel. Fifth-party defendants deny the
13	remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 59.
14	60.
15	Fifth-party defendants admit only that Urban FT Group, Inc. has received certain debt
16	funding from several financiers who maintain registered security interests that are typically
17	provided to financiers for such financings, but deny that such financiers have any security
18	interest and a second and a second in IIII as FT II. Fight a second in II. II. II. II. II. II. II. II. II. II
	interests, registered or otherwise, in Urban FT, Inc. Fifth-party defendants deny the remaining
19	allegations contained in Paragraph 60 as stated.
19 20	
	allegations contained in Paragraph 60 as stated.
20	allegations contained in Paragraph 60 as stated. 61.
20 21	allegations contained in Paragraph 60 as stated. 61. Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 61.
202122	allegations contained in Paragraph 60 as stated. 61. Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 61. 62.
20212223	allegations contained in Paragraph 60 as stated. 61. Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 61. 62. Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 62.

Page 5 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

I	63.
2	Fifth-party defendants deny that Plaintiff has fully and accurately quoted the testimony
3	provided by Richard Steggall during his March 3, 2022 deposition in Paragraph 63, and deny the
4	remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 63.
5	64.
6	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 64.
7	65.
8	Fifth-party defendants deny that Plaintiff has fully and accurately depicted the testimony
9	provided by Richard Steggall during his March 3, 2022 deposition in the allegations set forth in
10	Paragraph 65, and deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 65.
11	66.
12	Fifth-party defendants deny that Plaintiff has fully and accurately depicted the testimony
13	provided by Richard Steggall during his March 3, 2022 deposition in the allegations set forth in
14	Paragraph 66, and deny the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 66.
15	67.
16	Fifth-party defendants admits only that Richard Steggall is the Executive Chairman of
17	Urban FT Group, Inc. and deny the remaining allegations as stated.
18	ANSWER TO FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
19	(Veil Piercing-Alter Ego)
20	68.
21	The allegations contained in Paragraph 1-46 are not directed at these fifth-party
22	defendants. Rather they are directed at fourth party plaintiff, UFT (North America) LLC.
23	Therefore, the allegations contained in Paragraph 1-46 do not require an admission, denial, or
24	other responding directly from these defendants. Insofar as any allegation contained in
25	Paragraphs 1-46 is construed as against these fifth party-defendants, these defendants deny each
26	and every allegation, or asserts that they lack the knowledge or information sufficient to form a

1	belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in each paragraph, and the allegations
2	are therefore denied. Answering further, these fifth-party defendants incorporate their answers to
3	the allegations contained in Paragraphs 47-59 as and for the remaining allegations re-asserted in
4	Paragraph 68.
5	69.
6	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 69.
7	70.
8	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 70.
9	71.
10	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 71.
11	72.
12	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 72.
13	73.
14	Fifth-party defendants deny the allegations contained in Paragraph 73.
15	WHEREFORE, Fifth-party defendants further deny any and all allegations asserted by
16	Fifth-Party Plaintiff Rex Stevens not specifically admitted to herein, and that Fifth-party Plaintiff
17	Rex Stevens is entitled to recovery of any kind, included, but not limited to: (1) that Stevens is
18	entitled to a declaration that the sale is governed by applicable UCC law, under which it is valid;
19	(2) that Stevens is entitled to a declaration that Stevens became the legal owner of the Intellectual
20	Property by virtue of the UCC Sale; (3) that Stevens is entitled to a monetary award in an amount
21	estimated to be not less than \$3,961,830.34, plus any pre-judgment and post-judgment interest;
22	(4) that Stevens is entitled to attorneys' fees; and (5) that Stevens is entitled to a costs and
23	disbursements occurred herein; and/or any such further relief.
24	///
25	///
26	///

Page 7 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

I	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES
2	74.
3	Fifth-party defendant further assert and allege the following affirmative defenses as
4	follows:
5	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6	(Failure to State a Claim)
7	75.
8	As and for a First Affirmative Defense (failure to state a claim), fifth-party plaintiff's
9	claims, and each of them, fail to state a cause of action or claim for relief against fifth-party
10	defendants.
11	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
12	(Estoppel)
13	76.
14	As and for a Second Affirmative Defense (estoppel), fifth-party plaintiff is precluded
15	from asserting his claims, and each of them, as a result of his own action or inaction, under the
16	doctrine of estoppel.
17	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
18	(Laches)
19	77.
20	As and for a Third Affirmative Defense (laches), fifth-party plaintiff is precluded from
21	asserting his claims, and each of them, under the doctrine of laches.
22	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
23	(Unclean Hands)
24	78.
25	As and for a Fourth Affirmative Defense (laches), fifth-party plaintiff is precluded from
26	asserting his claims, and each of them, under the doctrine of unclean hands.

Page 8 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

(No Liability for Attorney Fees)	
79.	
As and for a Fifth Affirmative Defense (no liability for attorney fees), fifth-party plaintiff	
is not entitled to recovery of attorney fees on any of his claims.	
SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
(Statute of Limitations)	
80.	
As and for a Sixth Affirmative Defense (Statute of Limitations), fifth-party plaintiff's	
claims, and each of them, are barred by the applicable statute of limitations.	
SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
(Personal Jurisdiction)	
81.	
As and for a Seventh Affirmative Defense (personal jurisdiction), this court lacks	
personal jurisdiction over each and every fifth party defendant.	
EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
(Reservations of Rights)	
82.	
As and for an Eighth Affirmative Defense (reservation of rights), fifth-party defendants	
reserve the rights to allege any other affirmative defenses which may become apparent following	
the discovery process.	
///	
///	

Page 9 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

1	WHEREFORE, Fifth-party defendants demand judgment in their favor and against	
2	fifth-party plaintiff, Rex Stevens, dismissing his fifth-party complaint with prejudice, together	
3	with costs of suit and such other relief this court deems equitable and just.	
4	DATED this 8th day of July, 2022.	
5	5 MILLER 1	NASH LLP
6	6	
7	/s/ Thomas	
8	8 tom.sand@	Sand, OSB No. 773322 millernash.com
9	9 joseph.van	nce, OSB No. 25531 ce@millernash.com
10	katie.benne	Bennett, OSB No. 221482 ett@millernash.com
11	Phone: 503 Fax: 503.2	
12	111101 Heys J	for Fifth-Party Defendants Urban FT
13	13 Urban FT	c., Fintech Imaging Solutions, Inc., Client Solutions, LLC, UFT al Services, LLC, and Richard Steggall
14	14	ai services, LLC, and Richard Sieggaii
15	15	
16	16	
17	17	
18	18	
19	19	
20	20	
21	21	
22	22	
23	23	
24	24	
25	25	
26	26	

Page 10 - FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS' ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES TO THE FIFTH-PARTY COMPLAINT

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	I hereby certify that I served the foregoing FIFTH-PARTY DEFENDANTS'		
3	ANSWERS A	AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES o	n:
4 5	Anna Sortun, OSB No. 945279 Eric Beach, OSB No. 105783 Lauren B. Bernton, OSB No. 163439		Joshua M. Wolf, OSB No. 141892 Wolf Legal, LLC 2175 SW Raleigh St., Ste. 110
6 7	Tonkon Torp LLP 888 SW Fifth Avenue, Ste. 1600 Portland, OR 97204		Portland, OR 97210 Phone: 503.893.9788 Email: Josh@WolfLegalPDX.com
8	Phone: 503.221.1440 Email: anna.sortun@tonkon.com eric.beach@tonkon.com		Attorneys for Defendants and Fourth- Party Plaintiff
9		lauren.bernton@tonkon.com	J 33
10	Atto	rneys for Plaintiff, Fourth-Party	
11	Defendant, and Fifth-Party Plaintiff		
12	by the following indicated method or methods:		
13 14		prepaid envelopes, addressed to the	opies thereof in sealed, first-class postage- attorneys as shown above, the last-known and deposited with the United States Postal
15		Service at Portland, Oregon, on the	
16	X	by transmitting full, true, and correcourt's Cm/ECF system on the date	ct copies thereof to the attorney through the e set forth below.
17	X		ct copies thereof by electronic means to the
18			n e-mail address listed above on the date set sed to by the parties, the transmission was made
19		ill word of words effect format.	
20	DATED this 8th day of July, 2022.		
21			/ Katherine Bennett
22		K	atherine Bennett
23			Of Attorneys for Fifth-Party Defendants Urban FT Group, Inc., Fintech Imaging Solutions, Inc., Urban FT Client
24			Solutions, LLC, UFT Professional
25			Services, LLC, and Richard Steggall
26			

Page 1 - Certificate of Service